



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS

Grundfragen der Homerkritik. Von PAUL CAUER. Dritte umgearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Erste Hälfte. Verlag von S. Hirzel in Leipzig, 1921. Pp. 406.

The book needs no introduction: since 1895 it has been the manual for Homeric studies, and to see its period of usefulness thus prolonged is a cause for rejoicing.

Out of three books of the earlier editions, two *Textkritik und Sprachwissenschaft* and *Zur Analyse des Inhalts* are contained in the present volume. The second half is to bring the remaining book, *Der Dichter und seine Kunst*, and also an attempt to give a final answer (for the time being at least) to that part of the Homeric question which lies closest to us: "wie und wann sind *Ilias* und *Odyssee* in der uns überlieferten Gestalt, als literarische Gebilde geschaffen worden." This will be the distinguishing feature of the new edition—for the second (1909) was intentionally limited to the discussion of questions of method—and is an indication of the progress made in the last decade. For it we shall have to wait until next Easter, but in the meantime we may note the extent and carefulness of the revision in the part before us.

The author calculates that much more than a third of the present volume is written anew, and to the reviewer the estimate seems modest. Important changes of view have not been found necessary, but there is a frequent re-wording and recasting of the old material together with a great and skilful condensation—of polemical passages especially. The space thus gained and the pages now added are devoted to a presentation of new material and a valuable discussion of recent ideas. Work done in Germany up to the time of publication comes into consideration; but—except for Leaf's *Homer and History* (1915)—the use of foreign literature stopped with the beginning of the war.

In the first book the outstanding feature is a new chapter (pp. 180–97) on "Der Hexameter," remarkable because of its break with the eye-system of locating caesurae and diereses. The first fruit is the overturning of Witte's speculation about the genesis of the hexameter; and a still richer harvest may be expected in the future.¹

¹ Cf. also Shorey, *Classical Philology*, XVI (1921), 396. Since the foregoing was written Sturtevant has published "Word-Ends and Pauses in the Hexameter," *American Journal of Philology*, XLII (1921), 289–308.

In the first two chapters (pp. 12-50) the chief addition¹ is the discussion of my article "The Archetype of Our *Iliad* and the Papyri," *American Journal of Philology*, XXXV (1914), 125-48. The following articles in which the theory has been further developed and strengthened were inaccessible to Cauer. Even without them he agrees with me on the main issue:² we have "das Bild einer einheitlichen Überlieferung, die sich . . . bis ins 2. Jhdt. vor Chr. aufwärts verfolgen lässt," and the principal examples adduced are ones "in denen das Fehlen eines . . . Zusatzes die reinere Überlieferung darstellt." To Cauer I am indebted for the correction of an important item and the consequent strengthening of the theory. The external evidence points strongly to Σ 381 as an interpolation, but I did not see how that conclusion could be accepted. Cauer has now shown the way, and has also communicated Schöne's very satisfactory explanation of the scholium. With regard to the superfluous formulae for introducing speeches, we differ, but not so much as Cauer believes. I concur fully in the opinion: "Dass es im 2. Jhdt. vor Chr. irgendwo einen Text gegeben habe, der hierin das einheitliche Bild der Reinheit von allem Entbehrlichen geboten hätte, ist ganz unwahrscheinlich." I would go farther, indeed, and say that such a view is demonstrably false. My position, however, is merely that in this matter the preponderance of the longer version over the shorter was less in the second century B.C. than it was between the tenth and fifteenth centuries of our era, and that thanks to the papyri we can detect at least some of the interpolations of this type. I hope to return elsewhere to this question. In the meantime the emendation of Γ 453, which would clinch the proof of a single archetype, has become more important than ever.³ After a careful consideration of my objections, Cauer still (pp. 38 f.) holds to the emendation, and I am still compelled to dissent. Had we a clause beginning *ἔκευθον ἄν* || *εἴ τις ἴδοιτο* it might be conceded that X 253 Ω 418 would furnish close (not complete) parallels for the position of the particle. We have, however, *οὐ μὲν γὰρ φιλότῳ γ' ἔκευθον ἄν, εἴ τις ἴδοιτο* and that arrangement of words is without parallel in Homer. So, even on the principle that Cauer has formulated (p. 84) so well, we must refrain from the

¹ Note also the additional examples drawn from papyri published since 1909, especially P. Rylands 53. On p. 44 should be added to the "plus" verses in P. Morgan Ξ 231^a, which is mentioned in the T-scholia. The note on p. 22 fails to cite the most complete list of Homeric papyri—W. Schubart, *Einführung in die Papyrskunde*, pp. 478-80, for corrections and additions to which cf. *American Journal of Philology*, XLII (1921), 253 n.

² Very different is the opinion of Drerup, *Hom. Poet.*, I, 86 f. However, he stands and falls with Walter Müller whose work he has accepted *in toto*—evidently without testing it. Of the latter I have said the little that is necessary in *American Journal of Philology*, XLII (1921), 253 f.

³ Cf. the speculations in Drerup, *op. cit.*, 86 f.

emendation that creates a new difficulty.¹ The case against the emendation, as I see it, is even stronger: *ἐκεύθανον* offers two difficulties which can be explained; *ἐκευθον ἄν* offers only one difficulty, but that one seems insurmountable.

An excellent exposition of the weaknesses of Roemer's *Aristarchus Athetesen* has been added to the chapter (pp. 51-71) on "Aristarch." Prominent among them² is the misinterpretation of the obelos as a mark of cancellation—a fundamental error and only too widespread. Condensation is much in evidence in the fourth chapter (pp. 72-98) "Voralexandrinische Textgeschichte," but the section on the "epische Zerdehnung" has been re-written in view of recent discussions. I agree with Cauer in subscribing to Wackernagel's theory, but believe that the modifications made in *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*, page 66, deserve mention and acceptance.

A very proper appreciation of this book with its proof of an Attic veneer over our whole text is a prominent feature of the next chapter (pp. 99-135) "Erste Niederschrift." Here is included also a careful consideration of Kretschmer's objections to the *μεταχαρακτηρισμός*. The belief in the reality and importance of this element in the text-tradition of the Homeric poems has been winning ground, and Cauer has strengthened an already excellent presentation of the case. One of the examples now added is of particular interest: for *μέσσω δ' ἀμφοτέρων μητίσσομαι ἔχθεα λυγρά* (Γ 416) Christ conjectured—greatly to the improvement of the text *μῆ σοί γ(ε)—μέεσσω* and *μῆ σοί* being but different interpretations of *ΜΕΣΟΙ*. It seems to me possible to go farther: in this neighborhood ΔΕ may best be regarded as a corruption of ΑΕ and by its side may be put the ancient argument (B 573) over *Δονόεσσαν* or *Γονόεσσαν*. If so, this comes close to meeting Wilamowitz' challenge—grossly unfair as it is—to find at least one λ for γ. In the matter of "Athenian interpolations" there is a very patient refutation of the views of Allen, of Scott, and of Wilamowitz. A distinction is to be drawn between the latest strata of poetry found in an Attic edition and lines inserted in this edition after its completion. Both are "interpolations" but in a different sense, and the double meaning of the word is a logical trap. It is perhaps not too optimistic to hope that Cauer's warning against this danger will be heeded.³ The three lines of evidence combine to support the belief

¹ Bechtel's *ἐμεί' ἔπος* for *ἐμεῦ ἔπος* in X 454 should not be used (p. 83) as an instance of the violation of this principle, since it is based expressly on the belief that *ἔπος* nor *φέπος* nor (*φ*)*έπος* was used by the author of this section.

² I regret that Cauer (p. 117) no longer condemns Roemer's theory that Α followed Ι in Aristarchus' *Iliad*—K being a separate work. One consequence would be that Aristarchus and the Aristarcheans had different methods of citation—and that fact would have left some trace. Roemer's argument for *τῇ ἐχομένη* (*ραψωδία*) seems to me extremely weak.

³ On p. 121 A 265 should be classed with B 558, that the latter was known to Aristotle cannot be proved, cf. *American Journal of Philology*, XXXVII (1916), 29. Even Allen, *Homeric Catalogue*, p. 56, now abandons the defense of this line, being content to let it "fall in with the other lines preserved in a minority of Homeric MSS. of which we do not hesitate to say that they are additions."

that our tradition depends wholly upon an Attic edition of the sixth century. Up to that point Cauer's position is, to my mind, impregnable. Whether this was the first writing of the poems is another question, and one which can be answered from internal evidence alone; for the disappearance of earlier Ionic editions, against which Cauer (p. 126) argues, does not seem inexplicable.

The remaining chapter (pp. 136-79) "Die Sprachform," brings among much else of interest a brief refutation (p. 150 n.) of Scott's article on patronymics and an excellent criticism of Witte's work which reduces to a proper compass the value of his achievement.

"Die Heimat des *Odysseus*" (pp. 201-23) now opens the second book. Cauer, like Leaf, is an adherent of Dörpfeld's hypothesis, and has made a good presentation of his case. He has expanded the chapter by a discussion of the recent adverse German criticism; but, as there has been considerable writing in England (Shewan, Allen) and America (Brewster) which Cauer could not reach, there is still opportunity for a review of the whole controversy.

Cauer finds the nucleus of the Trojan legend in battles fought by Aeolic colonists, rather than in a punitive expedition of the king of Mycene and his men. The resulting discussion of the views of Eduard Meyer, Chadwick, and Leaf forms the most prominent new element in the following chapter (pp. 224-54) "Der historische Hintergrund der *Ilias*." The third chapter (pp. 255-95), "Umbildungen und Neubildungen der Sage," is formally a new unit, but based in part on old material. In such questions the author is less skeptical than the reviewer. In the absence of historical records the history undoubtedly present in the *Iliad*, must in the main continue to be a secret. Late accretions such as the Tlepolemos-Sarpedon combat, or the Athenian passages, may at times be recognized. The relation of the *Iliad* to other works—the Meleager, the Herakles poetry—may be divined. But beyond such matters the value of the discussion must lie in keeping before our minds the manifold possible solutions.¹

In the fourth chapter (pp. 296-349) "Kulturstufen," I may note first the increased appreciation of Platt's article on "Homer's Similes," and then the long discussion of Evans' and Poulsen's views. With the conclusion reached, I am heartily in sympathy: the Homeric world is neither Minoan-Mycenaean

¹ To mention briefly certain details. Cauer (p. 231) has failed to detect the weakness of Leaf's attack on Aulis, cf. Allen, *op. cit.*, 46 ff.—The linguistic argument (pp. 227, 233 f.) is not cogent, for we do not know the form of "Central Greek" dialect once spoken in the Argolis. It is at least possible that it would form as good a basis as Thessalian-Boeotian for the "Aeolisms" of the epos.—The *πρῶτον ψεύδος* in Della Seta's work (cf. p. 280) is the assumption that Ἀχαιοί is a metrical handicap. Except in the dative (Ἀχαιοῖσι) it is the only one of the three words which can be used at the end of the line, while Ἀργεῖοι is the only one with which a line can begin. It is to the poet's advantage to have all three in his vocabulary.—The treatment of Ἀργος seems open to criticism.

nor Graeco-Phoenician nor Ionian. Epic poetry in the course of its development has been exposed to influences of all three sorts and the resulting amalgamation is what we find in Homer. From this sort of evidence too much must not be expected for the analysis of the poems, the value of any particular criterion depending on a number of factors and varying accordingly. The section on writing is practically new and shows that the discovery of the Cretan writing has not taken the significance out of the fact that there is in Homer but one allusion to the art, and that in Z. To the discussion of bronze and iron is added a notice of Beloch's latest treatment of the subject.¹ The section on the armor is left practically unchanged, as is also the one dealing with the ἔδνα. Slight additions are made in the matter of the war chariot, where Cauer is more conscious of the difficulties involved in Van Leeuwen's explanation; and of the palace, notice of the work of Oelmann and of Pfuhl;² and of the temple, the important interpretation of γέφυραι. A fuller statement of the views of Helbig and Doerpfeld about the disposal of the dead is now given. Cauer supports Doerpfeld's hypothesis while conceding that his views about the customs in historical times may not be correct. Interesting is the discussion of H 332 ff. For reasons indicated briefly in *American Journal of Philology*, XLII (1921), 276 f. I regard this section as interpolated. Cauer's view is different, but his impression that this passage was prepared for readers rather than for hearers agrees well with the post-Pisistratean date I favor. Finally, a note of the second edition has been expanded into a new section on cult statues.

Similar but more difficult is the problem of religious ideas treated (pp. 350-406) in the two last chapters "Olymp und Hades" and "Der Götterapparat im Epos." In it too the revision is extensive. I note especially the discussion of the views of Wide and of Hedén, the section on the entrance of new deities into the Olympic circle, and the criticism of Reibstein and of Müllder.

The book will be a more useful tool than ever, and we may look forward with eagerness to its completion.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

¹ I should class Σ 34 Ψ 30 as instances of tools rather than weapons. I believe it can be shown that the external evidence against Δ 123 is warrant for regarding it as an interpolation. Then only the mace of Areithoos and the proverb of the Odyssey are left to testify for iron weapons.

² Bassett's interesting article, "The Palace of Odysseus," *American Journal of Archaeology*, XXIII (1919), 288-311, 413, was unfortunately inaccessible. It must be the starting-point for future discussion.